

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application in light of the present amendment and remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-19 have been rejected.

Claims 20-24 have been added.

Claims 2 and 8 have been canceled, without prejudice.

Claims 1, 5-7 and 10-19 have been amended.

Claims 1, 3-7, and 9-24 are pending in this application.

Formal Matters

Claims 5, 6 and 11-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. In addition, Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite in that it fails to point out what is included or excluded by the claim language inasmuch as claim 5 is an omnibus claim. Further, claims 6 and 11-19 were objected to under 37 CFR §1.75(c) as being in improper form having multiple dependent claims depend from other multiple dependent claims. These rejections and objection are respectfully traversed.

Claim 5 and claim 6 have been completely recast to instead recite that the first and second data carriers can be smartcards, similar to the recitations of claims 11, 12 and 14.

Claims 11-19 have been amended to eliminate multiple dependent claims depending upon other multiple dependent claims.

Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been overcome.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Substantive Matters

Applicants acknowledge with thanks the Examiner's indication that claims 2 and 8 would be allowable if rewritten to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Accordingly, independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the recitations of claim 2, in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Claim 2 is subsequently canceled. Claims 3-6 are dependent on newly amended claim 1 and applicant's above comments with respect to claim 1 are hereby incorporated by reference. For the foregoing reasons, claims 1 and 3-6 are now deemed allowable.

Similarly, independent claim 7 has been amended to incorporate the recitations of claim 8, in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Claim 8 is subsequently canceled. Claims 9-19 are dependent on newly amended claim 7 and applicant's above comments with respect to claim 7 are hereby incorporated by reference. For the foregoing reasons, claims 7 and 9-19 are now deemed allowable.

Therefore, applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the above objection.

Claims have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Messiet (US 5,875,404) in view of Martineau (US 5,915,226). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The independent claims, 1 and 7, have been amended into a condition for allowance as detailed above.

Claims 3-6 and 9-19 are dependent on claim 1 and 7, respectively, and therefore include all of the recitations of those claims, which is hereby incorporated by reference, and thereby deemed allowable as well for the same reasons.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been overcome.

Claim 20 and 21 have been added having similar recitations to claim 15 and 16 respectively. Claim 22 has been added having similar recitations to claim 10. Claims 20-22 are dependent on amended claim 1 and applicants' above comments with respect to claim 1 are hereby incorporated by reference. Therefore, claims 20-22 are now deemed allowable as well for the same reasons.

Claims 23 and 24 have been added specifying that the system can be incorporated into a cellular telephone or vehicle. Claims 23 and 24 include all of the recitations of claim 1 hereby incorporated by reference. Therefore, claims 23 and 24 are now deemed allowable as well for the same reasons.

The other references of record have been reviewed and applicant's invention is deemed patentably distinct and nonobvious over each taken alone or in combination.

For the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully request that the above rejections be withdrawn.

Inasmuch as this amendment distinguishes all of the applicants' claims over the prior art references, for the many reasons indicated above, passing of this case is now believed to be in order. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any


claim, unless applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicants' attorney at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection or through an Examiner's amendment.

Authorization is hereby given to charge any fees necessitated by actions taken herein to Deposit Account 50-2117.

Customer Number 22917
Motorola, Inc.
Law Dept. - 3rd floor
1303 E. Algonquin Rd.
Schaumburg, IL 60196

Respectfully submitted,
Howell et al.

By: 
Brian M. Mancini
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 39,288
Phone: (847) 576-3992
FAX: (847) 576-3750